



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,359	11/20/2003	Vadivel Ganapathy	275.00080101	3660
26813	7590	08/20/2009	EXAMINER	
MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A. P.O. BOX 581336 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1336				PAK, MICHAEL D
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1646				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/718,359	GANAPATHY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Pak	1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 12,13,20,21,27,28,50,57,78,79 and 82-136 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57,76 and 77 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 12,13,20,21,27,28,50,78,79,82,83,88-91,96-102,107-109,114-120 and 129-132 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 84,86,92,94,103-106,110-113,121-128 and 133-136 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 85,87,93 and 95 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-11, 14-19, 22-26, 29-49, 51-56, 58-75 and 80-81 have been cancelled. Claims 57, 76 and 77 are withdrawn. New claims 84-136 have been added. Claims 12-13, 20-21, 27-28, 50, and 78-79 and 82-136 are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 84, 86, 92, 94, 103-106, 110-113, 121-128, and 133-136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while enabling for a polypeptide with at least 95% identity to SEQ ID NO:6 and functions to Na⁺ dependent transmembrane transport of citrate, does not reasonably provide enablement for A) a polypeptide variant encoded by hybridizing nucleic acid wherein the polypeptide has a specific amino acid position 500 change from phenylalanine to leucine; B) a polypeptide which has 95% identity to SEQ ID NO:6 wherein the polypeptide has a specific amino acid position 500 with leucine. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The first paragraph of § 112 requires that the patent specification enable "those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without `undue experimentation.'" Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk AIS, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)); see also In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). ("[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art."). Whether making and using the invention would have required undue experimentation, and thus whether the disclosure is enabling is a legal conclusion based upon several underlying factual inquiries. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 735, 736-37, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1402, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As set forth in Wands, the factors to be considered in determining whether a claimed invention is enabled throughout its scope without undue experimentation include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims.

Likewise, in Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the court affirmed the holding of invalidity of claims to analogs of the EPO gene under § 112 for lack of enablement where applicants had claimed every possible analog of the EPO gene but had disclosed only how to make EPO and a very few analogs. "[D]espite extensive statements in the specification

concerning all analogs of the EPO gene that can be made, there is little enabling disclosure of the particular analogs and how to make them There may be many other genetic sequences that code for EPO-type products. Amgen has told how to make and use only a few of them and is therefore not entitled to claim all of them." Id., 927 F.2d at 1213-14, 18 USPQ2d at 1027.

Claims encompass polypeptide variants, derivatives and fragments of SEQ ID NO:6 wherein the polypeptide comprises a phenylalanine to leucine change at amino acid position 500 or has a leucine at amino acid position 500. However, one skilled in the art cannot make and use variants, derivatives and fragments of SEQ ID NO:6. The amount of direction provided in the specification is limited to a specific species of SEQ ID NO:6. Thus claims encompass fragments of SEQ ID NO:6 which does not have phe at position 500 to change to leucine or the leucine at position 500 is not relevant to the transporter specificity domain. One skilled in the art would require empirical experimentation in order to determine the changes to SEQ ID NO:6 sequence without disrupting the structure for the protein activity. However, the specification does not teach how to use variants, derivatives and fragments of SEQ ID NO:6 which are functional. Transporters have active sites which are essential for the proper function of the protein in transporting citrate (Inoue et al., Journal Biol. Chem., 2002). A fragment of the polypeptide which is truncated in the middle of the various domains or a fragment which does not allow the proper folding of the domain or is deleted would not be expected to function. The state of the art is such that one skilled in the art cannot predict the outcome of changes to protein structure using the primary amino acid

structure as the predictor (Bowie et al., *Science*, 1989). Thus, one skilled in the art cannot use the primary amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:6 polypeptide alone to predict the tertiary structure of SEQ ID NO:6 polypeptide which would be required to determine the transporter function and proper folding of SEQ ID NO:6 polypeptide. No working example is provided to determine whether a change in the domains of SEQ ID NO:6 polypeptide fragment or variant would provide proper function. It would require empirical experimentation to determine whether the variants of SEQ ID NO:6 is functional . Thus, such fragments and variants encompass a genus with a large number of species which are not functional. In view of the extent and the unpredictability of the experimentation required to practice the invention as claimed, one skilled in the art could not make the invention without undue experimentation.

Therefore, based on the above Wands analysis, a preponderance of the evidence supports a conclusion that one skilled in the art would not have been enabled to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

3. Claims 12-13, 20-21, 27-28, 50, 78-79, 82-83, 88-91, 96-102, 107-109, 114-120, and 129-132 are allowed. Claims 85, 87, 93, and 95 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646